NOMINATIONS OF JAMES F. GOODRICH, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY; THOMAS K. TURNAGE, TO BE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE; AND JOHN S. HERRINGTON, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

NOMINATIONS OF

JAMES F. GOODRICH, OF MAINE, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

THOMAS K. TURNAGE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

JOHN S. HERRINGTON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

SEPTEMBER 24, 1981

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
86-781 O WASHINGTON : 1981

5201-3

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN TOWER, Texas, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina	JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia	HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire	HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Virginia
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine	SAM NUNN, Georgia
ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa	GARY HART, Colorado
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana	J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama	CARL LEVIN, Michigan

RHETT B. DAWSON, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE E. COWART, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Goodrich, James F., nominee to be Under Secretary of the Navy	3
Hayakawa, Hon. S. I., a U.S. Senator from the State of California	9
Turnage, Maj. Gen. Thomas K., nominee to be Director of Selective Service	10
Herrington, John S., nominee to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy	22

NOMINATIONS OF JAMES F. GOODRICH, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY; THOMAS K. TURNAGE, TO BE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE; AND JOHN S. HERRINGTON, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1981

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10:08 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 212, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. John Tower (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Tower, Thurmond, Warner, Cohen, Jepsen, and Stennis.

Also present: Senator S. I. Hayakawa.

Staff present: Rhett B. Dawson, staff director; James F. McGovern, general counsel; Paul C. Besozzi, minority counsel; Christine E. Cowart, chief clerk: Louis W. Arny III, Michael B. Donley, Edward B. Kenney, James R. Locher III, David S. Lyles, Jose E. Martinez, Anthony J. Principi, professional staff members; Richard D. Finn and Ralph O. White, Jr., research assistants; and Tamara L. Jones, staff assistant.

Also present: Buzz Hefti, assistant to Senator Warner; Jim Dykstra, assistant to Senator Cohen; Jon Etherton, assistant to Senator Jepsen; Frank Krebs, assistant to Senator Cannon; Greg Pallas, assistant to Senator Exon; and Peter Lennon, assistant to Senator Levin.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN TOWER, CHAIRMAN

Chairman TOWER. The committee will come to order.

This morning the committee will consider in the following order the nominations of James F. Goodrich to be Under Secretary of the Navy, Maj. Gen. Thomas K. Turnage to be Director of Selective Service, and John S. Herrington to be the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. We will also consider various routine military nominations which have been pending before the committee for the requisite period of time. I would like to hear from each of the nominees individually before we act on them as a committee. What we will do is hear the nominees and permit members of the committee to ask questions. At that time I would hope that we can complete action on the confirmations.

Before I call on Mr. Goodrich, I would like to advise the committee that each of the nominees previously met with

committee staff and has agreed to take all actions that are necessary to comply with the committee's policies and procedures concerning financial disclosures and potential conflicts of interest.

Our first nominee this morning is Mr. James F. Goodrich. I understand that the chairman of our Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee will introduce him. Therefore, I will call on Senator Cohen.

Senator COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to present him to you for the position of Under Secretary of the Navy. It is a pleasant but difficult task, because he has accomplished so much in his lifetime. It will be difficult for me to not spend all day talking about his achievements.

I would simply point out to members of the committee that this country has always depended upon its supremacy of the sealanes for keeping those sealanes open. We have learned from our Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), that for the first time in our history, we no longer have that so-called thin margin of superiority, we now are even in an inferior position with respect to the Soviet Union.

The CNO testified that if it became a contest between the United States and the Soviet Union, the result would be quite muddy. In view of that fact, I think it is all the more important that we commit ourselves to the 600-ship Navy which the President of the United States has advocated on many occasions, as well as the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Navy.

With that in mind, I think we have to appoint to fill these positions, such as the Under Secretary of the Navy, the most qualified individuals we can find. That is why I wanted to take this opportunity to talk just a moment about Jim Goodrich and why I think he will be such a tremendous asset to the administration.

He is one of those individuals who I think can be put in the column of superb choices. For nearly 45 years he has had a professional involvement in and personal commitment to the development of this country's maritime posture. After graduating from the University of Michigan, he served 3 years in the merchant marine.

He then began a distinguished career as a naval architect on the west coast and went on to several shipyard management posts.

Now, the portion of Mr. Goodrich's career with which I am most familar is his 14 years at Bath Iron Works in Bath, Maine, where he served as executive vice president, and eventually chairman of the board.

I will not take this opportunity, as I have on so many occasions before, to salute the high achievements of Bath Iron Works. I think all the members here know that we do, in fact, produce ships not only on schedule but ahead of schedule and under budget, as you read so many times in the Washington Post. I think the success of Bath Iron Works over the years, not only in producing quality ships but in producing them on time and under the cost they have been contracted for, is a remarkable achievement.

Jim Goodrich personifies this commitment to excellence. I know he is committed to the 600-ship Navy. He has precisely the kinds of skill and competence and frugality with the public dollars that we should be looking for. So, I commend him to you highly, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Chairman TOWER. Thank you, Senator Cohen.

Mr. Goodrich, your nomination reference and biographical sketch will be entered in the hearing record at this point.

[The nomination reference and biographical sketch follow:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
September 11, 1981.

Ordered, that the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

James F. Goodrich, of Maine, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, vice Robert J. Murray, resigned.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JAMES F. GOODRICH

President Reagan has nominated James F. Goodrich for the position of Under Secretary of the Navy.

For nearly 45 years, Mr. Goodrich has had a professional involvement and personal commitment to the development of the Nation's maritime posture. His long career in the maritime industry began soon after he graduated from the University of Michigan, in 1937, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering. He joined the Merchant Marine and, from 1937 to 1939, served in various capacities, becoming a Licensed 2nd Assistant Engineer, Unlimited. In 1939 he began his career in shipbuilding as a marine engineer and machinist with Bethlehem Steel Company at Sparrows Point, Maryland. In 1940 he became Chief Naval Architect and Marine Engineer for the Todd Pacific Shipbuilding Company in Tacoma, Washington, remaining with Todd throughout World War II. In 1946, Mr. Goodrich left Todd to co-found Deep Sea Trawlers, Inc.—a company that pioneered the Alaska King Crab Industry. Returning to Todd in 1948, he served for ten years as the Assistant General Manager and General Superintendent of Todd's Seattle, Washington Shipyard. In 1958 he became General Manager of Todd's Los Angeles Shipyard.

In 1964, Mr. Goodrich joined Bath Iron Works Corporation as Executive Vice President. In 1965 he became President and Chief Executive Officer and served in that capacity until 1975 when he was named Chairman of the Board of Directors. Mr. Goodrich served as Chairman of the Board until 1978 when he retired.

Mr. Goodrich is a member or former member of several national organizations including the Department of Defense Industry Advisory Council, the Maritime Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Naval Institute, the Propeller Club of the U.S., the Navy League of the U.S., and the American Society of Naval Engineers. He has held several top posts with the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, and is a former Vice President and Director of the Shipbuilding Council of America. In 1973, Bowdoin College awarded Mr. Goodrich an honorary L.L.D.

Mr. Goodrich is married to the former Helen Poe of Tacoma, Washington. They have three children: James P. Goodrich of Vashon Island, WA; Dr. John F. Goodrich of Portland, ME; and Nancy McGraw of Darien, CT.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Goodrich, we would like to hear from you now. First, I would like to inquire, do you have any of your family here? We would like them to stand if they are present.

STATEMENT OF JAMES F. GOODRICH, NOMINEE FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes. My wife is present.

Chairman TOWER. Will she please stand? We are delighted to have you here. If you have a formal statement, you can submit that for the record and it will be printed in full or you may summarize it. You may proceed as you see fit. The floor is yours.

Mr. GOODRICH. Thank you, Mr Chairman. I have a brief prepared statement that I will submit for the record. With your permission, I shall simply summarize it at this time.

I am honored to be here today and to have been nominated for this position. When Secretary of the Navy, John Lehman, asked me to come out of retirement and serve as the Under Secretary of the Navy, I considered it a great opportunity.

Over the past several years, I have become increasingly concerned about our Nation's security and economic well-being. Mr. Lehman's invitation to join his team gives me an opportunity to become involved personally in the challenging task of improving our national security while at the same time getting the maximum value for the dollars that we spend.

If confirmed as the Under Secretary, my primary interests will be the efficient and effective management of the Department of the Navy, fostering cooperative and businesslike relations with industry, and helping to insure that our people continue to see the Navy and the Marine Corps as a satisfying and rewarding profession.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I will be very happy to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of James F. Goodrich follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. JAMES F. GOODRICH, NOMINEE FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. Chairman: My statement is necessarily, and I believe properly, brief. I am honored to have been asked to serve my country and the President as Under Secretary of the Navy, and to be here today to ask confirmation by this distinguished body of my nomination. When the Secretary of the Navy, John Lehman, asked me to serve as Under Secretary, I considered it a great opportunity. Over the past several years I have become increasingly concerned by the seriousness of the issues that face our nation and our naval forces. We are challenged by the need to put our national economic house in order. At the same time the growing Soviet threat requires that we face up to the problem of the decline in our naval forces. This nomination, if you approve, will give me the chance to contribute more directly to this most important effort.

I do not come before you professing to have ready solutions to the myriad and far-reaching problems confronting our Navy, nor do I claim more than a general understanding of many of them. My assignment, with your consent, will be to support and assist John Lehman to see that this country has the powerful, modern, and ready Navy and Marine Corps which its vital interests require.

One place where I believe I might contribute is in the management area. Judicious and dedicated stewardship of the resources made available to the Navy is, and must be, an integral part of our efforts. If confirmed, I will focus on the effectiveness and efficiency with which we manage. It is my observation that, despite many vocal and effective critics, the Departments of Defense and Navy are responsibly managed. Nevertheless I will give my best effort to keep Navy Management sound and responsible and, if possible, to make it better.

My forty years as a businessman and shipbuilder have made me keenly aware that our security rests not alone in the force of arms, but also in the health and vitality of our commerce and economy from which our fleets and armaments derive. I know that one of John Lehman's foremost objectives is to foster a more harmonious, cooperative, and businesslike relationship between the Department of the Navy and its builders and suppliers. I hope that my experience, judgment, and perspective will be of value to that effort.

During my years as a manager, I have come to understand that people are the most vital and fundamental component of any undertaking. In addition to striving for efficiency in our management of things, and for improvement in our dealings with the private sector, I would have no higher goal, as Under Secretary of the Navy, than to make Navy and Marine service, not just acceptable work, but a satisfying and rewarding profession for the men and women who comprise our Navy and Marine Corps team.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. In return for your support, I will strive to be worthy of your trust and that of the American people. Thank you very much for this opportunity to share my views.

Chairman TOWER. Thank you, Mr. Goodrich. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I have two brief questions. I ask, in the interest of time, that they be included in the record and submitted to Mr. Goodrich for answers.

Chairman TOWER. They will be submitted to Mr. Goodrich to respond to for the record.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to extend to Mr. Goodrich a word of welcome. I rejoice over his fine qualifications. The good word about him got here before he arrived, particularly with reference to naval construction and management of shipyards. I certainly wish you well, sir, and am glad to meet you.

I think my little chat with you, shows very obviously you are a man of purpose and like the idea of doing something about our problems that we have now. I wish you well. I will certainly cooperate in every way I can.

Chairman TOWER. Senator Thurmond?

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Goodrich, you have come with a very fine reputation. As I understand, you produced the ships ahead of time and below estimated cost in most cases, did you not?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. That is the kind of man we are looking for.

Mr. GOODRICH. Thank you.

Senator THURMOND. I am very pleased that the President has located you and that you have been appointed to this important position. I am just wondering if you have thought anything about the place of public shipyards compared with private shipyards? Of course, my opinion is that there is an important place for both.

Mr. GOODRICH. Senator, I share your opinion. I have been very aware of the changes in the posture of the naval shipyards in the past 15 or 20 years away from new construction and into the very important role of overhaul, repair and modernization of major ships, especially combatants in the naval force.

At the time, I certainly did support the decision that naval shipyards would not be involved in new construction, and that there was a capability in the private shipbuilding industry to supply the needs of the Navy and of the commercial side in the Merchant Marine.

I think that has proven to be a fact. We have had some serious problems in certain areas but I think those can be overcome. But in repair and maintenance I very much support the position of the naval shipyards, especially on the type of work that is done in those facilities.

Senator THURMOND. I am wondering if you have thought much about what you expect to accomplish to assist the President in obtaining a stronger defense as quickly as possible.

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, sir, I have given that a great deal of thought.

First, one of the reasons that I chose to come out of retirement and accept this position with the Navy Department was my very sincere concern about the deterioration and the posture of our naval forces, our naval facilities, and the Marine Corps.

I have felt for some time, and I feel more strongly as time goes on, that we, the United States, are in a very serious international situation. One of the principal ways that we are going to show the other countries of the world we seriously intend to continue to be

86-781 O - 81 - 2

the United States of America as we want it, is a strong presence at sea.

I believe that the goal of a properly balanced 600-ship Navy is a very proper one and we should proceed immediately to do everything possible to accomplish that.

Senator THURMOND. I presume you would always be responsive in answering any requests from this committee.

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Again I want to commend the President for your nomination. The fact that you are able to have Senator Cohen endorse you so highly will, of course, weigh very heavily with us on the committee. Thank you.

Chairman TOWER. Senator Cohen?

Senator COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Goodrich, you stated you favored moving as quickly as possible to a 600-ship Navy properly balanced. Do you mean properly balanced with types of ships within the 600-ship figure or properly balanced against other considerations, such as the budget?

Mr. GOODRICH. My first concern is a navy that is properly balanced to be consistent with the national objectives handed down by our Commander in Chief. We can count ships in many different ways, but the resulting force must be consistent with the national policy laid down by the President. I feel that we should be very concerned about the makeup of the fleet in order to meet the commitments that will be expected of the Navy and the Marine Corps with respect to that national policy.

Senator COHEN. Today's New York Times indicated the Secretary of Defense plans, or has proposed, certain cutbacks in the Navy's program. Some 29 ships will be taken out of the fleet. Are you familiar with those 29 ships?

Mr. GOODRICH. I am aware of the number and the makeup of some of the ships that are to be laid up, yes.

Senator COHEN. As far as you know, is there any cutback so far as new construction, the so-called 5-year plan?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, there have been considerations but no final decisions have been made with respect to cutbacks. I would more properly state them as tradeoffs in order to establish a proper balance in the naval force.

Senator COHEN. I guess my question is: Are there cutbacks or tradeoffs in new construction from what we have been told will be the goal of the Navy?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes.

Senator COHEN. When do you expect those to be revealed?

Mr. GOODRICH. I think, sir, that I would have to wait for the Secretary of Defense and the President to make those decisions before I can answer the question.

Senator COHEN. In your judgment, will those cutbacks in any way diminish the goal of trying to achieve the margin of superiority that we have always maintained in our naval power?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes. I think that any cutbacks in the present naval force will be detrimental to the achievement, at an early date, of the kind of 600-ship Navy we need.

Senator COHEN. Will it also be fair to say that it will have a negative impact on the development of the so-called Rapid Deployment Force projection in the Middle East?

Mr. GOODRICH. Because the final decision has not been made in the selection of ships that will make up that Rapid Deployment Force, I cannot precisely answer your question. I can only say that I am deeply concerned about any cuts that might be made in rapid deployment because, if we are to make the show of force that it appears we must make in the Far East and especially in the Indian Ocean, the role of the Marine Corps in that force is of supreme importance to our national commitment.

Senator COHEN. I have one final question. Would it be fair to say that with the cutbacks we will recommend, that necessarily we are going to have to be restricted in the commitment this country can make in terms of its dispersal or projection of force, that we cannot maintain the current commitments we have if, in fact, we are going to reduce the level of spending for the naval program? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, that is a fair statement.

Senator COHEN. I have some other questions for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Jepsen?

Senator JEPSEN. Mr. Goodrich, I want to give you a personal welcome and thank you for being willing to serve. I have no questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, may I just make one observation?

Chairman TOWER. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Goodrich, you answered the question very readily. I believe that to a man of your capability and experience it ought to be pointed out very clearly that you are not necessarily bound by all the answers you gave when you get into your duties and find the facts are different from what you understood, one of your responsibilities is going to be to make firm recommendations to this committee and to others in the Department of Defense.

I would not think it is fair to you to go in with some restrictions by your answers to these questions. You understand you are selected on your experience and ability to make hard judgments and we hope you will feel free to do this for this committee and for everyone else.

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, sir, I understand that. I am pleased that you would say that to me because as I learn the facts, I am sure I will have opportunities to change my mind and I will certainly come forward and not try to protect an earlier position, if I think it was wrong.

Senator COHEN. Mr. Chairman, if I could add, I hope all of us will hold him to the commitment that we are going to produce ships all across the country under budget and ahead of schedule.

Mr. GOODRICH. With the help of this committee, Senator, we will do the best we can, but I am afraid I cannot make a final guarantee.

Senator STENNIS. That is all.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Goodrich, do we have your assurance that if you are confirmed by the Senate, you and any staff over which you have direct authority will respond to all the questions put to you by this committee or any other appropriate committee of the Congress?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, sir.

Chairman TOWER. We will want your candid professional opinion when you respond to those questions.

Mr. GOODRICH. I understand and I will respond enthusiastically.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Goodrich, as you know, only one of our shipyards is capable of building a large-deck carrier. Do you believe it is in our interest to consider making the capital investment that would permit us a second source for construction of large-deck carriers?

Mr. GOODRICH. Senator, I am very much committed to the policy that we should eliminate, to the greatest extent possible, sole-source procurements. I believe this has been a reason for some of the difficulties that the Navy and the shipbuilding industry have encountered in recent years.

However, when you ask me the question with respect to the large-deck nuclear carrier, I would say I would hope that there would be an opportunity to avoid sole source, but at the present time I do not see a solution to that problem.

Chairman TOWER. In fact, going to a second source might be more costly than relying on sole source.

Mr. GOODRICH. I think that is true, yes, sir.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Goodrich, of course we are very much concerned with the contract procedures and cost overruns. It is going to be incumbent on you, using your vast experience in the shipbuilding industry, to try to hold the costs down as much as possible, and to get the most favorable contract.

If we are going to achieve the objective of a 600-ship Navy, we are going to have to have a funding profile for our ships that will permit us to operate within the constraints of finite funds.

We now have strong popular support for increasing our military capability. I think our ability to sustain that popular support is going to be contingent on our ability to produce the best possible weapon systems at the lowest possible cost. The more efficiently and economically we can operate, the better chance for maintaining the popular support necessary to build the capability required to meet our commitment to national security and our interests over the next years.

So, we will be watching with great interest what you do.

Mr. GOODRICH. Thank you, sir. I will do my best.

Chairman TOWER. Are there any other questions from members of the committee? Mr. Goodrich, thank you very much.

Mr. GOODRICH. Thank you, Senator.

Chairman TOWER. Our next witness is Maj. Gen. Thomas K. Turnage, nominee to be Director of Selective Service.

I might note that General Turnage has a splendid background. He was born in Conroe, Tex. He received his early military discipline from a fine old military prep school in Texas. Since that time he has elected to become a Californian.

Senator Hayakawa is here to present him today. Senator, you are welcome.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE S. I. "SAM" HAYAKAWA, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Senator HAYAKAWA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is my pleasure to introduce to you this morning Maj. Gen. Thomas K. Turnage, who has been nominated by President Reagan to be Director of Selective Service. General Turnage first came to California in 1945, after military service in Europe. It was during his visit that he met his wife, Betty Jane. They have been residents of California ever since. Tom and B. J. have two children who are also living in California. Their son, Bo, who is here today for his father's confirmation hearing, attends dental school in California.

Returning to college after World War II, General Turnage joined the California Army National Guard and was recalled to active duty in 1950. General Turnage remained active with the California National Guard after his return from Korea in 1952 and was successfully assigned as an infantry battalion commander, combat command executive officer, and Chief of Staff of the 40th Armored Division.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I first met General Turnage when he served during the Reagan years in Sacramento. For the past 2 years, General Turnage has been in Washington as the Assistant for Training and Readiness to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

It is because of his involvement with manpower issues that he was selected to serve as Executive Officer for the Military Manpower Task Force established by President Reagan to study this problem.

I feel confident that President Reagan has made a very wise choice in General Turnage and I wish him well in this difficult but exciting undertaking as Selective Service Director. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. Thank you, Senator.

General Turnage, your nomination reference and biographical sketch will be entered in the hearing record.

NOMINATION REFERENCE

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 31, 1981.

Ordered, that the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Thomas K. Turnage, of California, to be Director of Selective Service, vice Bernard Daniel Rostker, resigned.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MAJ. GEN. THOMAS K. TURNAGE, ASSISTANT FOR TRAINING AND READINESS TO THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (RESERVE AFFAIRS), CALIFORNIA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

General Turnage was commissioned as an Infantry officer in 1942, was later assigned to the 386th Infantry Regiment of the 97th Division, and served as a Platoon Leader during combat in Europe. After VE Day, he was redeployed to Japan where he commanded a company during occupation duties until 1946.

Returning to college after World War II, he joined the California Army National Guard in 1949 and was recalled to active duty with the 223d Infantry Regiment,

40th Infantry Division, in 1950. During subsequent training in Japan and combat in Korea, he served as an infantry battalion operations officer and executive officer.

General Turnage remained active with the California National Guard after return from Korea in 1952, and was successively assigned as an infantry battalion commander, combat command executive officer, division G4, division G3, and Chief of Staff of the 40th Armored Division.

After reassignment to Military Department Headquarters in Sacramento in 1967, he served as State Inspector General; Deputy Adjutant General, Army; Deputy Commanding General, Army; J3, Army; and, Commander of the California Task Force. These were successive assignments interrupted only by a previous tour as Division Commander during 1974–1975.

General Turnage returned to the 40th Infantry Division as its Commander in December 1977. General Turnage was promoted and federally recognized as a major general on 25 June 1974. He was reassigned to his current position in November 1979.

Decorations and Awards: Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star Medal; Meritorious Service Medal; Army Commendation Medal; American Campaign Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal; European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with Star; World War II Victory Medal; Army of Occupation Medal; National Defense Service Medal; Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation; Armed Forces Reserve Medal; Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal; Korean Service Medal with Two Stars; United Nations Service Medal; Combat Infantryman Badge with Star; California Medal of Merit with Three Stars; California Commendation Ribbon; California Federal Service Ribbon; California State Service Ribbon; California Service Medal; California Drill Attendance Ribbon.

Military Affiliations: Member of Secretary of Defense Reserve Forces Policy Board; Member of Executive Council, National Guard Association of the United States; Member of National Advisory Board, Association of the United States Army; Reserve Officers Association; United States Armor Association; National Guard Association of California; and, U.S. Army War College Alumni Association.

Civic Affiliations: Armed Services Commission, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce; Executive Board, Long Beach Area Council, Boy Scouts of America; Rotary International; Community Advisory Board, Institute of Continuing Studies, California State University; UCLA Alumni Association; George Washington University Alumni Association; and, former member, Riots and Disorders Task Force, and Advisory Committee, Project Safer California, both of California Council on Criminal Justice; as well as various other affiliations.

Civilian Occupation: Assistant for Training and Readiness to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

Chairman TOWER. General Turnage, we will be delighted to hear from you now. You may submit a prepared statement for the record and summarize it for us or you can proceed in any way you see fit.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. THOMAS K. TURNAGE, NOMINEE TO BE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

General TURNAGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At the outset I would like to thank Senator Hayakawa for changing his schedule to come here for this introduction. I appreciate that very much. I have a very brief prepared statement in connection with my pending nomination as Director of the Selective Service System.

Having devoted my life to the colors by wearing the uniform of the U.S. Army, I have a deep appreciation for military manpower issues. Because the Selective Service System is concerned with our most precious asset, that is the youth of our country, I feel honored to be nominated as Director of this important agency.

I accepted this nomination with the personal commitment to improve the service which the System renders to the Nation, strive for efficiency and economy in expenditure of all public funds, to increase public confidence in the peacetime operations and wartime capabilities of the System, to assure a completely fair system

for furnishing manpower over to the Defense Department, should Congress ever determine it necessary to institute involuntary military training and/or a service program, and to respect the conscientious convictions and religious scruples of every citizen, acting always within the authority and limitation of such laws as Congress shall enact.

With your concurrence, Mr. Chairman, I should like to maintain on a continuous basis a close relationship with this committee and with your staffers and to seek your guidance and counsel about the important issues that will mutually confront us.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my brief prepared statement. I shall be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman TOWER. Thank you, General. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. General Turnage, we talked a little before the session opened and referred to the Volunteer Force concept. I told you my opinion about it. I do not feel like binding you now as to what you believe in, particularly in connection with the All-Volunteer Force concept.

You will be working under the President of the United States, the Chief Executive of the Nation. To a large degree, you will be free to give him your opinion and should give it to him. I do not know that you should be out here advocating something contrary to his position.

So, I try to avoid putting anyone on the spot before they go in. You have already been accepted by the President and nominated. How do you feel about that? Do you feel free to give your rock-bottom opinion about it now? Is the All-Volunteer Force adequate? Is that alone an adequate remedy to get the needed manpower of the type and quality that you know we need? Do you want to express yourself on that or withhold your opinion on it now?

General TURNAGE. I will be delighted to respond to your wishes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. What do you think about the situation, particularly with reference to adding on now some 200,000 or 300,000 extra people, that has been mentioned in connection with the next 5 years?

General TURNAGE. While I have not had occasion to discuss the subject personally with the President, I have read everything that is available from him with regard to his philosophy and I think I understand what he said before the election and since he has been the Chief Executive.

I have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting his position on the matter. Moreover, as you are aware, he has appointed a Presidential Military Manpower Task Force to study the subject in depth, which consists of representation from all elements of the Government, to come up with what I consider to be the most objective, forthright view of the problem.

I see a direction that is positive and productive and I think he is going in the right direction. I must say, in all candor, that I do not believe we have achieved what we need for the readiness to defend the country yet but I know that he is supporting all initiatives that are designed to strengthen the readiness of our armed services.

I am hopeful that, as the situation develops with the task force and they make recommendations to him, they will be promptly implemented.

Senator STENNIS. I know he is going to do his best. I believe if we get the true facts to him, even though it may not be a popular position, it may not be popular for me, but I believe that he will probably change his mind to the extent of standing up and telling the American people that they need a modernized Selective Service System for certain limited service.

When the President does that, we will introduce a bill along that line. I think that puts you in a very key role. All I want you to promise to do now is to give your personal attention, active attention, in trying to help the Chief Executive find a solution to this problem.

I have seen it come and go. I know a little bit about human nature and we are woefully inadequate in many ways and that is with due respect to a lot of fine people within the service. We have a bill here that is supposed to improve the quality of these selectees and it draws all kinds of fire. A lot of testimony winds up with a bill to increase pay. We are not able to do enough about the quality.

Anyway, I call to your special attention what I think is the greatest problem now in connection with our military preparedness and hope you will give it your special attention.

General TURNAGE. Thank you, sir. The promise you requested is easy to make. I will make every attempt to do that.

Senator STENNIS. It is a major part of your responsibility. You feel that way too, do you?

General TURNAGE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. This is not just an administrative office to keep the records and all—you have a role beyond that.

General TURNAGE. I understand that, sir. Thank you.

Senator STENNIS. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. Senator Thurmond?

Senator THURMOND. General Turnage, I think you are well qualified to fill this position. I wish you well in your work and I congratulate the President upon your selection. Now what is the status of the ongoing registration program?

General TURNAGE. The initial program was reinstituted after President Carter made his decision, sir, and the first registration was held over a 2-week period in 1980. A second registration was held in January 1981. In both instances, Senator Thurmond, the results achieved were notable, somewhere in excess of 90 percent of the anticipated number of registrants.

Then the program went into a continuous registration program for those persons born in 1963 and the results have not met the expectations suggested from the results of the first two experiences. However, I was informed as of yesterday morning by representatives from the Selective Service System that in recent weeks a notable increase in the number of registrants has been experienced.

Now, if you consider the entire registration period something in excess of 85 percent of expected registrants have in fact complied with the law. More than that, the percentage of compliance in

continuous registration has increased, and that has been happening in a somewhat profound way.

Officials attribute this increase to some initiatives that have been taken by the Selective Service to provide better information, by sending letters to high school graduates and taking other initiatives to get the word out. While I cannot give you what is projected for the future, at least at this time they are optimistic about the results.

Senator THURMOND. General Turnage, what effort is being made to locate those who have not registered?

General TURNAGE. The Selective Service System informs me that they have two programs in effect. One, an active program and then a more passive program. The principal issue or action at the present time is being handled at the Justice Department where they have identified 134 individuals who are suspected violators.

It is my understanding that action is being taken at the Justice Department but that officials are giving every opportunity to those people who have failed to once again register. The objective is not to take punitive action but to give them an opportunity to comply with the law.

I understand, once again, that this passive-compliance program has been one of the factors leading to increased registration in the third cohort.

Senator THURMOND. During the Vietnam war a lot of people were confused about the situation and very many people feel the basis for the registration was unfair. For example, we exempted, I believe, all the college students. What are your general views on how to achieve real equity if we have to return to the draft?

General TURNAGE. Sir, it is my impression, based on the historical data that I have read regarding the System, and the actions taken by the Congress, that most of those deficiencies which led to questions of equity were resolved in 1970 and 1971 when many of the provisions for deferments or postponements were changed.

Now the System only has, as I understand it, three principal provisions for delay in induction. One is for hardship, one is for conscientious objection, and one is for college students but only until they complete the current semester in which they're enrolled. At the end of that semester, they would then report to the duty station.

If this continues, it seems to me that a greater equity will prevail in the System and thereby less opportunity for criticism of it.

Senator THURMOND. I am wondering if you have thought much about the conscientious objector. If we should have a war, don't you feel that there is a place for the conscientious objector to serve his country in some way and not just escape on the theory that he is a conscientious objector? And proving he is not a conscientious objector is a very difficult thing.

General TURNAGE. Yes, sir. First, I understand that by a Supreme Court decision, a conscientious objector may now claim that status not simply by virtue of his affiliation with a specific church or religious organization but he may do so on the basis of his individual conscience that he is forbidden from participating in a war.

86-781 O - 81 - 3

Now, if the proper authority can determine the sincerity of that position, I think it is incumbent on the Selective Service System to zealously guard that right and that concern on the part of the individual and then offer him alternative means of service.

I believe the Selective Service System is prepared not only to administer that program but has the manpower to do so. If these people are sincere in their beliefs, I believe they should also be willing to provide some alternative means of service. I fully endorse what I think you have suggested here.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, General. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. Senator Cohen?

Senator COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Turnage, Bernard Rostker came to this committee back in November 1979. He testified that he would be impartial and not an advocate one way or another on the matter of registration for Selective Service and the Volunteer Force concept.

He said he would be neither an advocate nor opponent for the continuation of the All-Volunteer Force but had an obligation under the Selective Service System to be able to meet the manpower needs of the Defense Department. At the hearing I commended him for at least trying to maintain that sense of neutrality, not being an advocate one way or the other about the All-Volunteer Force but rather devoting his full capability to meeting the Pentagon's manpower needs at a time of mobilization.

I was wondering what do you see as your role as head of Selective Service? Do you agree with Mr. Rostker's position not to be an advocate one way or the other, but rather devote whatever sources and talents you have to fulfilling the Pentagon's manpower needs at a time of mobilization? Is that how you see your role?

General TURNAGE. Sir, I cannot be as clinical as Dr. Rostker was about it based on the fact that not only am I serving or hope to serve in the role as Director of Selective Service but I have also been appointed as the Executive Officer of the President's Military Manpower Task Force, whose role and charge is to take those initiatives which will increase the efficiency and the probable success of the All-Volunteer Force.

So, in keeping with the President's philosophy, I want to make the All-Volunteer Force work to the extent of my ability in conjunction with the other members of the task force.

However, I think that I can be completely unbiased about the specific issue in my role as Director of Selective Service in that it is an administrative role. I understand that I am obligated to fill the Department of Defense manpower requirements.

We do not have anything to do with establishing the requirements. I think my concern would be meeting the supply requested.

Senator COHEN. In other words, you are saying you are wearing two hats. As head of Selective Service your hat is essentially the white hat of neutrality, no color of gray, or brown, or black; it is simply neutral.

General TURNAGE. I would hope both of them would be white hats, Senator.

Senator COHEN. Let me get on to the other hat. You agree with that?

General TURNAGE. Yes.

Senator COHEN. Now, as a member of the President's Task Force on Manpower and Mobilization needs, you have some rather strong opinions of your own. I gathered when you initially testified you were somewhat tentative in your response to Senator Stennis, for example, saying: "I think I understand the President's position with respect to the All-Volunteer Force."

I drew from that the implication that you have a somewhat different perception of the quality or the efficiency or effectiveness of the All-Volunteer Force.

General TURNAGE. Please allow me to try to clarify.

First of all, my primary concern is a military force representing the Nation that is capable of doing the job in the environment in which we find ourselves. I am philosophically attuned to the idea that if we can avoid registration or avoid a draft, that would be an ideal thing to accomplish.

On the other hand, if it is in the interest of this Nation, I think possibly other decisions will be made. So, to the extent I can, I want to make the All-Volunteer Force work. In the event it is apparent that is not the case, I would not hesitate to make recommendations to the contrary.

Senator COHEN. I believe you do hold pretty strong opinions about that. You did testify in the House, back in March, as a member of the Policy Board at that time, that you felt we ought to move immediately to conscription and 6 months' service and then going into either "Individual" Ready Reserve or some other capacity.

You have that philosophical or pragmatic judgment you have already stated in that regard?

General TURNAGE. Yes, sir.

Senator COHEN. Do you intend to advocate that in your new position?

General TURNAGE. What I intend to advocate now is making the current system work, sir.

Senator COHEN. Let me come back to the current system. You talked about the 90-percent overall compliance figure in the registration. As I understand, the last cohort was about 70 percent. Is that right?

General TURNAGE. I understood, as of yesterday morning, it was about 70 to 75 percent.

Senator COHEN. So, we have had a fall off from the 90 percent initially because of the lack of awareness, either of awareness or lack of compliance, conscious compliance, with the requirement to register. We are talking about a significant number of people.

Even if we get up to 90 percent, assuming it is 90 percent, 10 percent of 2 million young men, you are talking about 200,000 people. How will the enforcement actions against 134 serve in any way to get at the problem of endorsing the law? Out of 200,000, 134 is not a very good enforcement mechanism.

General TURNAGE. I agree.

Senator COHEN. What do you propose that we do?

General TURNAGE. I intend to intensify some of the initiatives that have already been taken with regard to letting it be known that registration is a requirement of the land. There is every

reason to believe it is not widely known. I state that based on the differences in results achieved in the first two registration periods as opposed to the one ongoing now, and I think that can be done.

More than that, I have not been in the Selective Service System up to this time because of my other duties and because of the status of these hearings. The information that has been available to me has only been provided on an as-requested basis.

So, I am sure there is a great deal more for me to learn about it after I have had a chance to study it in some detail.

Senator COHEN. Just a couple other points and I will submit the rest of the questions for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Let me make it clear, so far as the All-Volunteer Force is concerned, I think there are some deficiencies in it. The reasons for the deficiencies are manifold. In my judgment, a great deal of responsibility must fall on the shoulders of Congress itself because of our own funding programs, because of our own attitudes about what that force should be.

I would note that we should not make the All-Volunteer Force a strawman that we continue to knock down day after day. I was disappointed to see, for example, a rather unwise, or certainly unfounded, charge being leveled against the All-Volunteer Force some time ago. My colleague, Mr. Jepsen, wrote a rather, I thought, well-reasoned, forceful rejection of the substance of that piece that appeared in the Washington Star.

I think there is a recognition on the part of all of us that there are a lot of deficiencies in the All-Volunteer Force, also there are promising signs. If we do the things we promise to do to make it work, we will see a turnaround in the loss of qualified people for whom pay is important, people with 13 and 14 years of service.

So, we have done some things in the last year or two to make our All-Volunteer Force much more capable and much more ready than it has been in the past. Maybe we have not done enough. Maybe we cannot do enough.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman and Senator Stennis, I keep hearing about the fact we are going to go to 200,000 or 300,000 more end strength. Yet I look in the morning paper and they are talking about cutting out an Army division.

Chairman TOWER. Let me respond to the Senator. Over the short term, it is the proposal of the Department of Defense to reduce registration to meet budgetary constraints. Therefore, we will be postponing the expansion of the registration service.

Senator COHEN. This comes back to the thing we were talking about, the Navy program as well. We are going to expand it to meet our global commitments. Suddenly we find because of budgetary constrictions we are going to start cutting it down, which means we have to reduce the size of that commitment.

Chairman TOWER. This is a temporary expedient.

Senator COHEN. I hope it is only temporary, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. I hope so, too.

Senator COHEN. The same thing can be said about our fighting force. It may very well be necessary, if we are going to have an expanded global commitment, to go to the draft to get those numbers. But, if we are not prepared to fund and pay for the cost of that, it seems to me it is a very unwise policy, spreading ever-

reducing numbers thinner and thinner around the globe. This means we would have to have a retrenchment, and that would have an impact on manpower as well.

My time is up, General. I have enjoyed your testimony. I will submit some questions to you for the record.

General TURNAGE. Thank you, sir.

Chairman TOWER. Senator Jepsen?

Senator JEPSEN. General Turnage, I fully intend to enthusiastically support your confirmation. I thank you for our visit that we had yesterday. As I said at that time, I do not know whether to congratulate you or give you condolence.

Your task as Selective Service Director is not going to be an easy one because of the apparent contradictions, some of which have already been mentioned here this morning. We pointed out to you that your testimony in the House indicated you were willing to move on or thought we should move on to a 6-month draft. At the same time you say today you think that avoiding registration or the draft is a good thing.

I am not pointing that out for any reason other than to make you aware that we are aware and I, as chairman of the Manpower Personnel Subcommittee, am aware of the tightrope and the various paradoxes and contradictions that you are going to experience.

I will take just a second to recall the embarrassment to your predecessor who presented us with a 3-inch-thick dissertation on why we should not have registration. It was a thick study and very well done. We had quite a sermon.

Within days after that was presented, the administration changed its position. I felt sorry for him when we asked him what happened. I find this morning the statements you have made about avoiding registration and draft are good. In your view, are registration and draft synonymous?

General TURNAGE. I consider them to be separate actions, although it is part of the total process of mobilization as I see it.

Senator JEPSEN. If you view them as a separate function, then what is your view of the assertion shared by many Americans that registration will inevitably lead to the draft?

General TURNAGE. I have never completely understood the rationale for the statement because they can be separate functions, they are separate functions. Obviously, one is prerequisite to the other. I look at the registration as a function similar to a number of readiness requirements we have in the Nation for emergencies, such as industrial preparedness, for example.

We may never have to go to war, and hopefully that will be the case, but that will not be any excuse for not having industrial preparedness. I guess the same logic could follow, by having industrial preparedness it would ultimately lead to a draft and war. I do not subscribe to that, Senator.

Senator JEPSEN. I do not either, as you know. You and I will be working quite a bit together and I will be looking forward to working with you. I will explain here first that I voted against registration. I am not known as a dove. I never have been. I voted against registration not because it was registration but because registration did not do anything.

Our problem is mobilization, our readiness problem. That is what we have, a readiness problem. Even today with everything out in the open and all has finally been admitted, we have a difficult time. We have had a fire fight in the last 15 days, among many other things.

We have a general readiness problem. I do not see that it really does much good for folks to go down to the corner post office and send us their name and address. We already have that. Then there are the psychological difficulties. We let the young folks think they have done their thing now and that we are all set.

Or worse than that it is used for leading everybody and the rest of the world to believe that we are getting ready. How do you feel about having the classification or what do you intend to do, if anything, with the registration information you have?

First of all, do we have a readiness problem?

General TURNAGE. Yes, sir, I agree.

Senator JEPSEN. Do you think there is anything that can be done with the Selective Service System or within your purview of authority that can help up us in this readiness problem?

General TURNAGE. Based upon the information provided by Dr. Rostker, whose name has been mentioned here two or three times this morning, we could have something like 4 to 6 weeks in calling people as opposed to conducting the whole process in a post-mobilization mode.

I am using his figures. I have not been able personally to go into those, Senator, but I think at this stage of the game, he must be considered to have been the authority.

From the standpoint of your question on registration as opposed to classification, I have given some thought to that. Even registration information is perishable. In fact the Selective Service System continues now, once an individual is registered, to send him correspondence to confirm his address.

In the same vein, it seems to me that the classification information, with the exception of the mode I will discuss in a moment with you, will be so perishable and so expensive that my inclination is not to recommend it to anyone.

Now, if you classify to the extent that you can exclude the obvious people, those who have mental problems or who are amputees and are unable to be mobilized, that would be productive and could save embarrassment at the time you have a mobilization process.

Senator JEPSEN. Along that line, that was one of the things, of course, that folks came in and said: "You cannot do that, it is a horrendous expense, especially in the physical area." I have been in the life insurance business for a quarter of a century and have issued hundreds of thousands of dollars of life insurance on the basis of just a few questions.

It takes 60 seconds to fill a form out with just basic questions. You can determine whether a person has had three heart attacks, has diabetes, and two busted eardrums. You are probably not going to take him in combat service. I think that would be very productive. The time it would take to check out those 100,000 folks that have those particular sets of circumstances would take 60 seconds.

Of course, we can do all kinds of things if we really identify the goals we want to achieve and we feel strongly about it. That is why that particular phase can be done. I want to make that point. They said it was $22 million. I maintain it was more like $3,500 to submit forms that it will take 30 seconds to fill out.

General TURNAGE. That is a distinction I would like to make between full classification as opposed to classifying the obvious people who are not able to be mobilized. I think that concludes the comments I have about it, sir.

Senator JEPSEN. Do you have any concept of what the emergency mobilization timetable is?

General TURNAGE. If I understand your question, based upon the projections now, the Defense Department has established the requirements and the Selective Service officials contend that with premobilization registration they can have the first inductees report to the AFEES in 13 days and they can have the first 100,000 inductees report at the end of 31 days.

Selective Service could then provide manpower on the basis of something in excess of 6,000 persons a day as long as it is required, and that figure would not be necessarily restricted by Selective Service capabilities but by the ability of the Defense Department to handle inductees at the AFEES.

Senator JEPSEN. That timetable does not do much for the first 45 days in a fire fight.

General TURNAGE. No, sir, it does not.

Senator JEPSEN. Is the Selective Service System going to plan for induction of veterans?

General TURNAGE. No, sir. We have no system to my knowledge.

Senator JEPSEN. The last administration said they had a plan. I wonder if you might check to see if it is still around. When we last talked about registration, they said we do not need it, we plan to induct veterans.

General TURNAGE. I will check and get the answer for you.

[General Turnage provided the following information for the record.]

A report on the subject of recalling veterans was sent to Congress by the Department in April as required by the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1981. The report is classified "Secret" and thus it would be inappropriate for me to comment on its contents in this forum.

Senator JEPSEN. One last question, General. You have a direct input on draft boards.

General TURNAGE. Yes, sir.

Senator JEPSEN. Do you believe that veterans and people over age 65 ought to be able to serve on draft boards?

General TURNAGE. I believe in both cases they should be allowed to, sir. I do not see that age should be a limiting factor. I think desire and competence should be the consideration. I think the current law has an implication there that bothers me a little bit because of my past military experience. I think it excludes exconvicts and veterans. I think there should be a distinction made.

Senator JEPSEN. I think there should be a distinction made there, too. If there is not a distinction made, let us find out why. That is ludicrous.

Chairman TOWER. Senator Jepsen, your time has expired.

Senator JEPSEN. One last statement, if I may.

The President appointed the Military Manpower Task Force and you are executive director. I would hope that as your committee proceeds in its deliberations you would keep the Manpower Subcommittee, which is going to have to act on a lot of your recommendations, informed and advised. It will help us all in the long run.

General TURNAGE. I will look forward to that opportunity.

Senator JEPSEN. Thank you.

Chairman TOWER. General, do we have your assurance that if you are confirmed by the Senate that you and your staff will respond to all questions by this committee or any other appropriate Member or committee of the Congress in a forthright and expeditious manner?

General TURNAGE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. Are there any other questions by members of the committee? General, thank you very much.

General TURNAGE. Thank you, sir.

Chairman TOWER. Good luck.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, may I say a word to the Chair?.

Chairman TOWER. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. I would like to submit for the record a copy of a letter to Mr. Herrington from me regarding his duties and my idea of the importance thereof.

Chairman TOWER. It will be placed in the record, Senator.

[The letter follows:]

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1981.

Hon. JOHN S. HERRINGTON,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am sorry that other pressing matters kept me from attending your confirmation hearing. I congratulate you on your nomination and wish you the best in the challenging task that lies before you.

Your job is a most important one. The strength of our Navy, like all our armed forces, is vitally dependent on the attraction and retention of qualified, capable active duty personnel. But our reserve forces are also an essential element of the military personnel equation, and the Navy Reserve is no exception. There are many fine reserve units today--dedicated people who want to be associated with the military but not on active duty. We must be sure to devote sufficient resources to train and equip these individuals so they will be prepared to respond when we need them.

I retain a deep interest in ensuring that our Navy personnel continue to be the finest afloat. I look forward to working together with you to preserve that level of excellence.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. STENNIS.

Chairman TOWER. Our next witness is Mr. John S. Herrington, nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

We will hear now from Senator Jepsen who would like to present Mr. Herrington to the committee.

Senator JEPSEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Today I have the privilege of introducing Mr. John S. Herrington who has been nominated for the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Mr. Herrington brings the very background that is vital for the execution of this

important office. He is a graduate of Stanford University with a degree in economics.

He also has a law degree from Hastings College of Law, University of California and is experienced as a practicing attorney over the last 16 years.

John Herrington served as first lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps and currently is attached to the Marine Corps Retired Reserve. He has first-hand experience of the special pressures that our personnel face as well as the sacrifices they are called upon to make in peace and wartime.

Since February 1981, Mr. Herrington has been attached to the Office of the President serving as Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Personnel. This has certainly provided him with the essential administrative experience for the post he is about to assume.

Mr. Chairman, the Manpower Personnel Subcommittee looks forward to working closely with John Herrington as we continue to pursue what is to enhance the military manpower readiness levels. I know the rest of the committee will want to join me in welcoming him here this morning.

It is also my honor to introduce Mrs. Lois Herrington. We welcome you today. We hope you enjoy this meeting. We thank you for coming.

Chairman TOWER. If you will please stand. We are delighted to have you.

Senator JEPSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I present John Herrington.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Herrington, your nomination reference and biographical sketch will be entered in the hearing record, and you may proceed in any way you see fit. If you have a written statement, you may submit that for the record and summarize it or read it.

NOMINATION REFERENCE

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
September 14, 1981.

Ordered, that the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

John S. Herrington, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Joseph A. Doyle.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN S. HERRINGTON

On September 14, 1981, John S. Herrington was nominated by President Ronald Reagan to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

Mr. Herrington was born in Los Angeles, California, on May 31, 1939, and graduated from University High School, Los Angeles, California in 1957. He is a graduate of Stanford University where he received his A.B. degree in Economics in 1961. He received his LLB and JD degrees from Hastings College of Law, University of California, San Francisco in 1964. He is a member of the California Bar Association.

From 1965 to 1967, Mr. Herrington served as a Deputy District Attorney in the Ventura County District Attorney's Office, Ventura, California. In 1967, he opened his own law office in Walnut Creek, California, specializing in real estate, corporate law, taxation, and contacts. He has expanded from his legal practice into a variety of investment undertakings. In February 1981, Mr. Herrington was appointed Deputy Assistant to the President, Director of Presidential Personnel.

Mr. Herrington served as a First Lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps. He is presently attached to the Marine Corps Retired Reserves.

Mr. Herrington is married to the former Lois Haight of San Francisco. They have two daughters, Lisa Marie and Victoria Jean. They reside in McLean, Virginia.

STATEMENT OF JOHN S. HERRINGTON, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. HERRINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the interest of time, I will simply say I am honored to be here. I am honored to be nominated by the President. I thank Senator Jepsen for the remarks he has made in my behalf. I would like to take questions and see if I can give you the answers.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Herrington, I am sure you are aware that there has been a great deal of concern about the lack of a viable Naval Reserve that is constrained in size and capability. How do you propose to strengthen the role of the Naval Reserve in a time of war and national emergency?

Mr. HERRINGTON. I am aware of the fact that they have indicated they need approximately 114,000 people and they hit a bottom of approximately 87,000. I think the problem is mainly money, how you allocate it, and what their mission is.

I do not feel sufficiently up on that problem at this time, even though I have read the statement of each of the gentlemen who has appeared from the Naval Reserve Association. I recognize the problem and I look forward to getting into it in more depth. That is about all I can say on that particular issue.

Chairman TOWER. Mr. Herrington, if you are confirmed by the Senate, would you give this committee the assurance you will respond to all questions put to you or your subordinates by this committee or any other appropriate committee of Congress in an expeditious and forthright manner?

Mr. HERRINGTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do. We consider one of our responsibilities to provide you with up-to-date accurate information and be responsive to you.

Chairman TOWER. Thank you. Senator Thurmond?

Senator THURMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Herrington, you seem well prepared to perform these duties and I congratulate you and the President on your appointment. I have just a few short questions. Do you fully support the total force concept?

Mr. HERRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Do you plan to give the necessary time to management of the Navy and Marine Reserve Forces?

Mr. HERRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Oftentimes the Reserve Forces take second place to overall manpower problems and I am pleased that you plan to give special attention to the Reserve problems. For instance, in World War II, 98 percent were civilian soldiers, that is, they came from the civilian sector.

If we have another war, undoubtedly the percentage may not be that high, but it will be very high. So, we have to have the Reserve Forces ready. The country cannot afford an Active Force large enough to protect this country. We have to depend on the Reserve and National Guard.

Is it your position that we should maintain a well-trained Reserve combat-ready force equipped to take the field shortly, if necessary?

Mr. HERRINGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND [presiding]. I have no other questions. Senator Jepsen?

Senator JEPSEN. Mr. Herrington, recent reports indicate that a high percentage of Navy personnel are using drugs and alcohol aboard ships and military installations. Judges of the Court of Military Appeals advised my staff that most of the cases on appeal involve drugs. They have seen an alarming increase in drug cases among junior officers.

What is your initial reaction to these reports and how do you think we ought to go about addressing these problems?

Senator THURMOND. Senator Jepsen, I have to leave to go to the Supreme Court and a meeting at the White House. Will you take over?

Senator JEPSEN [presiding]. I will.

Mr. HERRINGTON. Senator Jepsen, I have had first-hand knowledge of drug abuse work. I served as a narcotics prosecutor for a period of time. My wife, Lois, whom you just met, has left her job as senior prosecutor for several years in a major district attorney's office. We have been involved in drug diversion programs.

I know what I am saying when I tell you that drug abuse, whether it is in the military or elsewhere in society, is one of the biggest cancers in America. It is something that we all have to work on. I am not prepared to accept at this point that the drug abuse problem in the military is any more than it is anywhere else in society.

There are areas that I feel you can concentrate on to address this problem. One is detection. There currently is in the Navy a program of detection which we would like to expand. There is enforcement and prosecution that needs to be pursued vigorously because we are dealing with a criminal matter, not a social issue.

Finally, I feel that a program of education not only in the military but elsewhere can be very beneficial to address this problem.

Senator JEPSEN. Thank you for that very good answer.

Mr. Herrington, one last question deals with the Navy's ability to man the increasing number of ships required, number of personnel, particularly in the technical and supervisory positions. Navy projections now take into account the positive impact of increased retention rates which we hope to improve on with our new Senate military pay bill and right now we are enjoying relatively successful recruiting efforts.

In view of all these things the Navy still indicates they will be short of 24,000 personnel by fiscal year 1985. The shortage of experienced petty officers could even be larger, some people say even up to 35,000.

I hope that you can assure us this morning that in your new position you will give serious attention to this long-term manpower need and that you will address these problems. I will ask if you have any comment for the record on what we consider to be very serious, maybe the most serious area that we have, not only in the Navy but our Armed Forces across the board.

Mr. HERRINGTON. You certainly have addressed the main challenge of this office coming up with the deficiencies that you have listed. I am not willing to accept today the fact that we will be

35,000, or some figure, short by 1985. The recruitment goals have been met recently.

I think the legislation that Congress put through last year on sea pay and different types of pay have helped the situation that you are working on now, and this very valuable pay bill, of course, will go a long way to bring the kind of people back into the military and retain the kind of people that we need.

I am optimistic that this problem can be addressed. I realize the magnitude of it. I am prepared to tackle it.

Senator JEPSEN. I do not recall whether you were asked this or not, but as a procedural question we ask of all nominees, do we have your assurance that if you are confirmed by the Senate that you and your staff will respond to all questions asked of you by this committee in a forthright and expeditious manner?

Mr. HERRINGTON. Yes, sir, I make that promise.

Senator JEPSEN. I thank you and assure you that you will have the support of this committee. I expect your confirmation to be unanimous and to hopefully be made rather expeditiously.

Thank you again, Lois, for coming. Your combination of legal experience and qualifications is most impressive and I think this country is very fortunate to have you moving to the position that you are assuming. It will be very helpful for solving problems we have facing us. Thank you very much.

Mr. HERRINGTON. Thank you, Senator Jepsen.

Chairman TOWER. I am prepared to entertain a motion that the committee be polled.

Senator JEPSEN. I so move.

Chairman TOWER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I am prepared to entertain a motion that the routine nominations which have been before the committee the required period of time be reported favorably.

Senator JEPSEN. I so move.

Chairman TOWER. And that members of the committee be polled.

I ask unanimous consent that the record be held open until 5 p.m. for absent Senators to submit questions for the record. Is there any objection?

Senator JEPSEN. No objection, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TOWER. I am prepared to entertain a motion to adjourn.

Senator JEPSEN. I so move.

Chairman TOWER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[Questions submitted for the record with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN TOWER, ANSWERS SUPPLIED BY GENERAL TURNAGE

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Senator TOWER. Assuming you have had an opportunity to review the existing Selective Service System—the apparatus, the regulations—what is your initial analysis of system's strengths and weaknesses?

General TURNAGE. I have had the opportunity to make only a cursory review of Selective Service operations. I would like to defer answering this question until I have made an in-depth study of the existing system and would be able to make a more valuable analysis.

I am, however, convinced that substantial progress has been made during the last two years to revitalize the system and look forward to continuing improvement overall, particularly in the regulatory and programmatic areas.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM DIRECTOR

Senator TOWER. What do you consider your strongest qualifications to be for this position?

General TURNAGE. I see the job of Director of Selective Service as twofold. The first is to secure for the Nation a most effective standby manpower mobilization system; the second is to insure that the rights of all individuals would be protected in the implementation of that system. To the first task I bring 39 years of experience with defense mobilization issues. To the second task I bring a total commitment to the creation of a fair and equitable Selective Service through a fully developed system of due process.

STAFF AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Senator TOWER. Are you unwilling to hire staff members who disagree with you on a policy basis?

General TURNAGE. I welcome staff members who will bring new and creative ideas toward policy development. Intelligence, integrity and candor will constitute the principle factors in the personnel selection process.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Senator TOWER. What are your views on the need for feasibility of some form of National Service for American's youth?

General TURNAGE. The concept of national service is one that should be given serious attention. There are distinct advantages in a system of that nature such as the sense of equity, the concept of choice of service, and the fact that returning to a form of national service should fulfill our present manpower shortages such as in the IRR. On the other hand, it is a very costly program and one that may result in superfluous costs relative to military or civilian manpower needs. I feel that the idea needs greater study to determine if it is the best answer to fulfill the needs of the Nation.

THE DRAFT MECHANISM

Senator TOWER. It has been said that the Selective Service System consists of three functions: registration, classification, and drafting. Would you give us your views of these functions and how, and to what extent, they are interrelated?

General TURNAGE. Registration is the gathering of names and addresses in order to locate potential inductees, classification involves the use of citizen volunteers serving on local boards to determine the draft status of these potential inductees. The "draft" is the selection process, based on lottery, from those persons determined eligible to serve. These are stages in the mechanism for providing manpower to the Department of Defense.

RECRUITMENT OF LOCAL BOARD MEMBERS

Senator TOWER. What is your view on the need for and functions of local boards under the current Selective Service System?

General TURNAGE. The recruitment of local board members to serve on a standby basis is a step toward increasing the readiness of the Selective Service. These board members will already be selected and trained and will be ready to immediately begin the adjudication of claims should it be necessary to return to a draft.

Previous criticisms of the Selective Service System relate primarily to the concern for equity. Boards which are organized and board members who are trained in advance will significantly enhance the processing and adjudication procedures and in turn, diminish the controversy which has prevailed in this area heretofore.

TIME SAVED WITH REGISTRATION

Senator TOWER. This committee has strongly supported draft registration as an important contribution to our country's ability to mobilize in time of war or national emergency.

Could you describe the importance of registration in the mobilization process?

General TURNAGE. Based upon information provided by former Director Rostker, at least four weeks to eight weeks could be saved in manpower delivery capability with a pre-mobilization registration.

USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

Senator TOWER. General Turnage, the conference committee on the fiscal year 1982 Defense Department authorization bill is considering a provision that would grant the President the discretionary authority to require draft registrants to submit their social security numbers. The Selective Service System would use the numbers to identify those eligible young men who had disobeyed the law by failing to register.

In your personal opinion, would the use of social security numbers to enforce registration represent an "invasion of privacy"?

What is the official position of the Selective Service System on the provision in conference? What is your personal opinion?

General TURNAGE. The matter of Selective Service requesting a registrant's social security number is under litigation at this time. I am, therefore, reluctant to make personal comments on the issue.

It is my understanding, however, that the Selective Service position on the provision in conference is that such legislation in not needed at this time. Selective Service officials feel the problem of nonregistration is a matter of a lack of awareness of the obligation to register rather than a matter of enforcement.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN, ANSWERS SUPPLIED BY MR. GOODRICH AND GENERAL TURNAGE

SHIPBUILDING CONTRACTUAL PROBLEMS

Senator COHEN. Mr. Goodrich, we have been hearing a lot lately about contractual problems in the shipbuilding industry. You have a 30–40 year track record of success in that industry. What are the roots of these problems, and what will you recommend as Under Secretary to improve the situation?

Mr. GOODRICH. Over the years, there have been many sources of shipbuilding contractual problems. On the government's side: great turbulence in shipbuilding plans, with resultant heavy impact on industry's ability to project work loads; inadequate or erroneous design specifications; defective and late government furnished materials; surprise increases in quality assurance; and just too many change orders in general. On the contractors' side: insufficient material and manufacturing lead time estimates; overconfidence in constructing new designs; sub-contract difficulties; and work force problems, including inexperience, low productivity, strikes, and overall recruiting, retention, and skill shortfalls similar to the Navy's. As Under Secretary of the Navy, I plan to maintain close ties with the nation's shipbuilding management as well as other Navy and Defense acquisition officials. I believe that many difficulties can be defused or resolved quicker if top management is able to relate more closely with industry's capabilities and limitations. I plan to use my experience, along with that of George Sawyer and others on the Navy team, in grappling with these problems. We will focus on better short-term and long-term planning, improved contracting procedures, shortening acquisition lead times, and more understanding and confidence between the Navy and industry. We will be tracking our ship program's progress, in as steady and efficient, economic manner as possible. Stable long-term multi-year shipbuilding plans to carry out the national maritime strategy is a key objective, with continued contract achievements (on time, under target deliveries) rather than contractual problems.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY CONCERNS

Senator COHEN. Mr. Goodrich, given that we can solve today's contractual issues with the shipbuilding industry, a large problem of an overall decline of the American shipbuilding industry still remains. In fact, the Committee has received an IDA study that indicates that even with a 600-ship goal for the Navy, one or two yards may still have to cease new construction work.

Is this as serious as we are hearing, and what do you propose to help to alleviate it?

Mr. GOODRICH. Since the IDA report was forwarded to Congress last March, the free market forces have continued. Some attrition among the Nation's shipyards was considered likely, even with a planned 600-ship Navy. Sun Shipbuilding has recently dropped out of the new ship construction business. Several truths remain selfevident—namely, there is no shortcut to re-establishing the U.S. Navy and

merchant marine fleet, even under surge or limited peacetime mobilization conditions. The U.S. shipbuilding industry must be revitalized. A viable commercial ship program must be pursued to prevent further attrition of the industrial base. I agree with Secretary Lehman and Secretary Weinberger that we must pursue a vigorous and sustained buildup if we are to have the required forces in being to counter the rapid expansion of Soviet Naval power. I am encouraged by private shipbuilding management's interest, support, and investment "risk-taking" in gearing up to construct our increased program. The final key to help alleviate these concerns is the unstinting support of the Congress, whose charge by law remains "to raise a Navy."

IMPROVEMENTS IN SSS MOBILIZATION CAPABILITIES

Senator COHEN. Significant strides have been made under Director Rostker's leadership to modernize Selective Service's mobilization capability. What further steps do you envision to improve its ability to respond in time of mobilization?

General TURNAGE. Frankly, I will only be able to study this matter in some detail after I assume my new duties. However, I have some preliminary thoughts. It seems to me that in order to complete the revitalization of the Selective Service System we must complete the revision and publication of new regulations and procedures. We must bring the new Joint Computer Center to full operation. We must tackle the difficult problem of developing mobilization procedures for health professionals. In addition, we must train the volunteer local board members, select and train appeal board members, and establish and test the Alternative Service program. These and other initiatives seem to me to justify priority for early emphasis.

USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

Senator COHEN. Do you support the provision in the Department of Defense authorization bill giving Selective Service the authority to require that registrants provide their Social Security numbers?

General TURNAGE. I believe the matter of Selective Service requesting a registrant's social security number is under litigation at this time. I am, therefore, reluctant to comment on the issue.

POSTING LISTS OF REGISTRANTS

Senator COHEN. Do you intend to continue the Selective Service program of posting lists of registrants in public places as a compliance mechanism?

General TURNAGE. I understand that the posting of lists is a requirement of the Military Selective Service Act. If this is indeed the case, of course, I would continue to comply with the requirements of the law.

PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE SERVICE

Senator COHEN. Do you support the proposal for alternative service for conscientious objectors suggested by former Director Rostker?

General TURNAGE. It has been determined that the program for alternative service, required by the Military Selective Service Act and part of the system's revitalization process, has not been completed. Even though significant progress has been achieved, substantial effort still remains to develop this program to a satisfactory state.

I would like to take this opportunity, however, to reiterate my total philosophical support of the place of conscientious objection and alternative service in a draft system.

LOCAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Senator COHEN. What is the status of Selective Service efforts to establish local draft boards?

General TURNAGE. A program undertaken this spring to recruit, select and appoint nearly 11,000 standby local board members is nearing completion. Selective Service is processing the nominations from the Governors of 31 States at this time. The lists for the remaining states are in the hands of the other Governors and are expected soon. The response has been excellent and there is every reason to believe that the ensuing training programs will be successful.

PROBLEMS WITH COMPLIANCE

Senator COHEN. There have been reports that the number of nonregistrants is increasing. I have two questions:

What do you plan to do to increase the awareness of young people that they are required to register?

What do you plan to do to strengthen Selective Service's enforcement mechanism to increase compliance?

General TURNAGE. I understand from representatives of Selective Service that, in their opinion, the reason for the trend in lower compliance is a lack of publicity concerning the need to register. A recent public information effort on the Agency's part has resulted in an increase in compliance and would seem to add credence to their theory. I would like to study these trends and the matter of compliance at length before I undertake recommendations for Agency or Congressional action on the matter.

In any event, I am not satisfied with either the results or the projections and intend positive action to improve compliance overall.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROGER W. JEPSEN, ANSWER SUPPLIED BY GENERAL TURNAGE

PUBLICITY AND COMPLIANCE

Senator JEPSEN. About 93 percent of the young men who were supposed to register during the summer of 1981 have registered. Only 87 percent of those required to register in January of this year have registered. Even more startling, the Selective Service System currently projects that less than 70 percent will register after January of this year. Although these compliance rates should gradually increase over time, I am very concerned that the initial turnout for registration is becoming progressively smaller.

What are the reasons for this worrisome trend in compliance?

What can be done by the Selective Service itself and the Congress to improve compliance?

General TURNAGE. I understand from representatives of Selective Service that, in their opionion, the reason for the trend in lower compliance is a lack of publicity concerning the need to register. A recent public information effort on the Agency's part has resulted in an increase in compliance and would seem to add credence to their theory. I would like recommendations for Agency or Congressional action on the matter.

In any event, I am not satisfied with either the results or the projections and intend postive action to improve compliance overall.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS, ANSWERS SUPPLIED BY MR. GOODRICH

SHIPBUILDING CAPABILITY

Senator STENNIS. Several of our private shipyards are facing reductions in their work force over the next year or two followed by expected buildups starting in about 1984. What can be done by the Navy to reduce the loss of valuable shipbuilding capability over the next 2 years?

Mr. GOODRICH. There is little the Navy can do to fill the 1982-83 work force gap created by the limited orders in process, particularly in the merchant ship program placed by the previous administration. Over the longer period, our new construction capability will be substantially strengthened only if we can establish and sustain a reasonably assured long-term building and conversion program.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Senator STENNIS. Looking past the problems of the next two years, what suggestions do you have for putting our shipbuilding industry on a firm, healthy footing?

Mr. GOODRICH. Stabilize the industry with firm plans. I am confident that industry can adapt to an increased building program. Firm plans will also aid support industries, suppliers, and ship-peculiar component manufacturers. National maritime policy changes will be required to support increases in commercial ship demand. The overall effort will mobilize the industry, and it can adapt to a higher demand. Additional management actions, such as multi-year contracting, assigning priority to shipbuilding for raw materials and components, utilizing "convert-and-charter", and other rapid acquisition/conversion schemes all can be utilized to get industry back on a health footing.

Questions Submitted by Senator Carl Levin, Answers Supplied by General Turnage

CONTINUATION OF REGISTRATION

Senator Levin. There are reports that the President's Adviser Martin Anderson, is planning to recommend that registration be discontinued. What is your position?

General Turnage. To my knowledge, there is no plan by any member of the Administration to recommend that registration be discontinued. Registration is a topic that is being considered by the President's Military Manpower Task Force and a recommendation will be made to the President on the matter. I look forward to my involvement in the in depth study the Task Force will make and am confident that, based upon all available facts, an objective decision will be rendered.

CLASSIFICATION NOT NECESSARY

Senator Levin. Do you think that we should go beyond registration and begin peacetime classification?

General Turnage. My initial inclination is to recommend against classification due to the perishable nature of that classification as well as the expense involved. Classification involving the exclusion of individuals who would permanently be unable to serve, such as young men who are blind or who are amputees, may be productive and could save embarrassment and confusion at the time of mobilization.

SUPPORT AVF

Senator Levin. Dr. Korb, OASD (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), has said that it is premature to declare the AVF a failure and that "[t]he Reagan administration's view is that we should give AVF a full and fair try." (Washington Post, 6/8/81, A17). What is your opinion regarding this view?

General Turnage. I am philosophically attuned to the idea that if we can avoid a draft that would be the ideal thing to accomplish. To the extent I can, I want to make the AVF work and I feel the Administration is taking very positive steps to accomplish this. On the other hand, I would support a return to the draft if there are indications that not doing so would jeopardize our Nation's mobilization capability.

SUPPORT OF AVF

Senator Levin. The Administration proposes to add 200,000 to 250,000 personnel to the active forces over the next five or so years. Do you believe the volunteer policy can sustain active forces of 2.3 million or will the country have to resort to a peacetime draft?

General Turnage. Again, I can only say that I feel we should give the AVF every chance to work. At this time, our armed forces are meeting their recruitment goals. Should the force be increased to the point where the recruiting goals cannot be met or the demographic population variables prevent us from meeting these goals. we would of course have to consider alternatives.

PUBLIC SUPPORT OF DRAFT

Senator Levin. Recent public polls have shown a sharp decline in sentiment for a draft. A July-August 1981 Gallup Poll indicated that only 48 percent favored the draft and 43 percent were opposed. A year ago 58 percent favored the draft. Among the 18-24 year olds, 62 percent oppose the draft. Given this mood, what reasons would you present to the American public in arguing the case for returning to the draft?

General Turnage. I must add to this question by pointing out that a Harris poll released on September 24 found that 60 percent of Americans now support a military draft.

I support the President's position on the AVF and feel he is taking very strong steps to assure its success. If the AVF was placing the Nation's defense posture in jeopardy then we would have to take the case to the American public for a further review. I have every confidence that the American people will fully support those measures deemed essential to the Nation's security.

RFPB RECOMMENDATION

Senator Levin. On March 11, a representative of the Reserve Forces Policy Board, to which you belong, presented to the House Manpower Subcommitee a series of

recommendations regarding registration. Among other recommendations, the Board recommended the following:

"In addition to, or as a substitute for the penalty for failure to register, from the present fine or prison sentence which can occur only after lengthy and costly prosection, the law should be changed to provide for an automatic forfeiture of appropriate Federal benefits." What process do you propose for imposing this penalty on approximately 700,000 nonregistrants? How else will you deal with the massive nonregistration problem?

General TURNAGE. The recommendations of the Reserve Forces Policy Board are made on a majority opinion. I did not personally support this particular recommendation at the time.

I understand from representatives of Selective Service that in their opinion, the reason for non-compliance is a lack of publicity concerning the need to register. A recent public information effort on the Agency's part has resulted in an increase in compliance and would seem to add credence to their theory. I would like to study these trends and the matter of compliance at length before I undertake recommendations for action on the matter.

EQUITY IN THE PROCESS

Senator LEVIN. People who favor returning to the draft always include the caveat that it must be fair and equitable. What in your opinion would consitiute a fair and equitable draft?

General TURNAGE. In the past a major deterrence to an equitable Selective Service was the method of determing deferral or postponement from service. I understand that due to reforms of the Military Selective Service Act by the Congress in the early 1970's, virtually all deferments and postponements were eliminated; excluding conscientious objectors, hardship cases, and those persons who are physically or morally unfit. A random selection lottery was established during that period as well. These were, I feel, very crucial steps taken toward building a fair Selective Service System.

I will make no recommendations for changes in existing law at this time, but I can guarantee you that fairness and equity in the System will be my highest priority.

WOMEN AND ADMINISTRATION'S PLANNED PERSONNEL BUILDUP

Senator LEVIN. General Turnage, the Administration's ambitious plans to expand our military forces undoubtedly will require more personnel—estimates vary from 200,000–250,000. Do you see a greater role for women in the Services in light of this planned buildup?

General TURNAGE. I am aware that discussions are taking place concerning the need for more personnel. I have not been involved in these discussions and do not feel well enough informed on the issue to comment.

IMPACT OF WOMEN IN MILITARY

Senator LEVIN. The Army of late has had some second thoughts on expanded use of women in its ranks. In February of this year, the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel stated: "We have seen indications in readiness reports and so forth that there may be some really adverse impacts on readiness."

General Turnage, do you have similar concerns about the impact of greater use of women on military readiness, both during peacetime and during mobilization?

General TURNAGE. I understand that the Army is presently studying the readiness impact of women in its ranks. I do not feel I am knowledgeable enough to comment on this issue. I can only say that my personal impression has been that women have made a significant and meaningful contribution to our armed forces and they should continue to do so. I support the policy, however, that women should not be assigned to combat roles.

WOMEN AND REGISTRATION

Senator LEVIN. General Turnage, the Supreme Court has now said that the U.S. Constitution does not require registration of both men and women, but Congress still has that choice. What is your position on the registration of women—should they be registered? If not, why not? If women were registered, how would you recommend they be inducted during a mobilization period? Would you recommend to this Committee that the law be changed to require the registration of women?

General TURNAGE. A review of agency capability indicates that the Selective Service System can, with minimum personnel augmentation and procedural

changes, accommodate the registration of women in the event Congress should make that determination. The value of such a requirement is questionable, however, inasmuch as the services have apparently been successful in obtaining desired levels of women consistent with readiness objectives. If women were registered, my present view suggests that induction be accomplished in accordance with specific service requirements. I recommend no further change in the law at this time.

ACTION ON COMPLIANCE

Senator LEVIN. It has been reported that 92 percent of those eligible registered during the initial registration periods last year and in January of this year. Recent reports indicate that the percentage of those who must register when they turn 18 is running about 80 percent. These results indicate that conservatively a half million men are in violation of the law. How does the administration plan to remedy this problem of low response and large numbers of violators? How soon does the Justice Department plan to take action on violators? How accurate and complete are Selective Service procedures for identifying violators? By using Social Security files and Internal Revenue files, isn't the Federal Government trampling on individual privacy and becoming more and more a "Big Brother" operation? Isn't this a dangerous precedent in peacetime?

General TURNAGE. As the matter of Selective Service requesting a registrant's Social Security number is under litigation, I shall refrain from comment at this time. I am unaware of the Justice Department's plans for dealing with violators.

VIEWPOINT ON NATIONAL SERVICE

Senator LEVIN. What are your views about a system of national service as an alternative to the draft?

General TURNAGE. As I mentioned previously, the concept of national service is one that should be given serious attention, yet further study is needed to determine if it is the best answer to fulfill the needs of the Nation. There are distinct advantages in a system of that nature such as the sense of equity, the concept of choice of service, and the fact that returning to a form of national service should fulfill our present manpower shortages such as in the IRR. On the other hand, it is a very costly program and one that may result in the superfluous cost relative to military or civilian manpower needs.

Senator TOWER. I thank you for your presence here today.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee was adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.]

[The nomination on James F. Goodrich, Thomas K. Turnage, and John S. Herrington were reported to the Senate by Senator Tower on September 24, 1981, with the recommendation that the nominations be confirmed. The nominations were confirmed by the Senate on September 25, 1981.]

○